



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

collection, general management, and proper disbursement of these "taxes," is fully and excellently set forth in these pages. Sufficient warning is given in the book itself against confounding these theories with the actualities of practice, or with a modern view of what is or should be. The historical development of these theories and a critique of them on the basis of actualities and of modern views is promised in Part III, to which we look forward with much interest and with great expectation in the hope that at least some of the improvements suggested here will be included.

MARTIN SPRENGLING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ON ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENTS IN ISLAMIC THEOLOGY

Four important articles by Carlo A. Nallino lately appeared in *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, Vol. VII, fasc. II, 421-66. Not as well known as his countrymen, Guidi and Caetani, Nallino deserves to be heard, as shall presently appear.

The first article deals with a moot point in the development of Muṭtazilism. Šahrastānī and Maqrīzī report that Ġāhiz held the Koran to be a body which *might be* transmuted upon occasion into a man or a beast. The dogmatician al-Ġī and a few followers make Ġāhiz say that the Koran was a body which (*actually*) transformed itself now into a man and now into a woman.

Modern attempts to understand this strange opinion have been few and unsatisfactory. Sale thought it referred to literal and spiritual interpretation. S. Horowitz and Horten ingeniously and fancifully found in it the influence of Stoicism or some other philosophy. The weakness of all may be illustrated by the sanest, MacDonald, whom the American student should correct. In *Muslim Theology*, etc., p. 161, he says: "We have probably to see in his remark that the Qur'an was a body, turned at one time into a man and at another into a beast, a satirical comment on the great controversy of his time." As well might Jonathan Edwards have said this of the Bible. Moreover, the two forms of the report are mixed, with the poorer predominating. It is a conclusion drawn for Ġāhiz and other Muṭtazilites from his premises by his opponents, e.g., Aš'ari: "If the word of God was created, it was a body," etc. The slander of Ġāhiz goes back, as Šahrastānī shows, to the skeptic, irreverent Ibu ar Rawandi, who avenged himself on the Muṭtazilites for disavowing him by writing on "The Ignominies of the Muṭtazilites."

The second solves the problem of the origin of the Muṭtazilites in a manner which should find rapid and widespread acceptance. The anecdote of their origin, excellently set forth by MacDonald (*op. cit.*, 129 f.), has

recently been much disparaged. Many moderns have followed Steiner in seeking the point of departure for the Muṭʿazilites in the Qadarites. For the name the student may be referred to MacDonald (*loc. cit.*), and to Goldziher's *Vorlesungen*, page 100, where the word is explained as ascetic separatists. That the great master's authority may not give this general acceptance, it may be said blankly that this is fanciful and probably wrong. The dissent of the founders of Muṭʿazilism from the orthodox position arose in the differences of opinion which followed the Charigite revolts. The Charigites held that a committer of a great sin, though a professing Muslim, was an unbeliever. The orthodox held that a professing Muslim, though he commit a great sin, must be considered a believer (cf. MacDonald, *loc. cit.*). Either view was fraught with grave and far-reaching consequences in this present practical and political world, not only in the world to come. The early Muṭʿazilites *dissented, as neutrals, from both extremes*, and held that such a man was neither the one nor the other, but something midway between. The theologians of Islam, blinded by *furor polemicus*, early lost sight of these facts and branded these men as sectarians, dissenters from the orthodox belief. The historians give us the clue, where they speak of Muṭʿazilites as neutral in early *political* controversies. A historian, Masʿūdī, has preserved the connecting link between these and the *theological* neutrals. Of course, these men presently were anything but sapless neutrals in the rapidly rising and multiplying theological debates of their time.

The third article complements and adds valuable material to Goldziher's work on the relations of the (Charigite) Ibādites with the Muṭʿazilites (*Rev. de l'hist. des rel.*, LXII, 232).

The last note does for the name Qadarites (MacDonald, p. 128, who, with others perpetuates a slip of the great Pococke) what the second did for the Muṭʿazilites. *Qadar* does not mean "power," nor is the name quite *lucus a non lucendo* (Goldziher). It is merely a result of the clumsy and undeveloped technical terminology of the early days, 680-700, when Muslim Arabs first were driven to theological thinking, that men who called *qadar*, "absolute predestination," into question and debated upon its relation to free will, instead of simply accepting the koranic statements, were named *Qadarites*, "Predestinationists," just as early Charigites were called "judgment men" because they made the celebrated judgment on Ali's caliphate matter of debate by opposing it.

MARTIN SPRENGLING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO